SAN DIEGO COUNTY TRAFFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING OF

June 7, 2013

Traffic Advisory Committee Members

Automobile Club of Southern California

Mr. Hamid Bahadori

Board of Supervisors District 2 Representative

Mr. Walter Lake

Board of Supervisors Districts 3 & 5 Representative

Mr. Bob Campbell

California Department of Transportation

{absent}

California Highway Patrol - San Diego

{absent}

California Highway Patrol - Oceanside

Officer Daniel Hollywood

California Highway Patrol - El Cajon

Officer Kevin Pearlstein

{absent}

California Highway Patrol - Border

Mr. Bob Fleishman

Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of San Diego

Mr. Brian Kennedy

Pacific Safety Council

{absent}

San Diego County Sheriff's Department

{absent}

San Diego County Office of Education
San Diego County Bicycle Coalition

Mr. Bill Matella

Mr. Mike Kenney

Department of Public Works
Department of Public Works

{absent}

Traffic Advisory Committee Administration

Traffic Advisory Committee Secretary

Mr. Kenton R. Jones

Traffic Advisory Committee Staff

Mrs. Patricia Johnson-Horsman

Traffic Advisory Committee Staff

Mrs. Maria Rubio-Lopez

June 07, 2013 **MINUTES**

I.	Call to	o Order /	Roll	Call

11.

Pledge of Allegiance
Approval of Minutes from April 19, 2013 Ш.,

III. IV.					
SUB	JECT	LOCATION	AREA	PLANNING/ SPONSOR GROUP	
SUPI	ERVISORIAL DISTRICT 2				
A.	PARKING PROHIBITIONS	JULIAN AVENUE	LAKESIDE	LAKESIDE	
В.	AII-WAY STOP CONTROL	JULIAN AVENUE @ CARAWAY STREET	LAKESIDE	LAKESIDE	
C.	RADAR RECERTIFICATION	SWEETWATER ROAD	SPRING VALLEY	SPRING VALLEY	
D.	RADAR RECERTIFICATION	THIRD STREET/OLD JULIAN HIGHWAY	RAMONA	RAMONA	
E.	RADAR RECERTIFICATION	WOODSIDE AVENUE	LAKESIDE	LAKESIDE	
<u>SUPI</u>	ERVISORIAL DISTRICT 5				
A.	TWO-HOUR TIME LIMIT PARKING	DE LA VALLE PLACE	DEL MAR	SAN DIEGUITO	
B.	ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL	FALLBROOK STREET @ ALTURAS ROAD	FALLBROOK	FALLBROOK	
C.	RADAR RECERTIFICATION	EL CAMINO REAL	RANCHO SANTA FE	SAN DIEGUITO	
D.	RADAR RECERTIFICATION	EL CAMINO REAL	RANCHO SANTA FE	SAN DIEGUITO	
E.	RADAR RECERTIFICATION	GOPHER CYN ROAD	VISTA/BONSALL	BONSALL	

COMMITTEE REPORT OF:

June 7, 2013

Item 2-A

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:

2

SUBJECT:

Parking Prohibitions

LOCATION:

Julian Avenue, eight locations - both sides, between Prospect Avenue and Petite Lane, LAKESIDE (Thos. Bros. 1232-A4) Lakeside Community Planning Group

INITIATED BY:

DPW Traffic Engineering

REQUEST:

Establish Eight Parking Prohibitions

PROBLEM AS STATED BY REQUESTER:

At your December 14, 2012, meeting the Committee was informed of DPW-Traffic Engineering's request for the establishment of eight parking prohibitions to address results of a recent road review. After much discussion, your Committee recommended the establishment of the proposed parking prohibitions. On March 13, 2013, the Board referred this matter back to the Chief Administrative Officer to work with a resident, Robert Speake, and others in the area.

On April 26th, 9:42 am, DPW staff sent an email to Mr. Speake regarding his opposition to the proposed parking prohibitions in the vicinity of Caraway Street:

"Department of Public Works (DPW) staff reviewed your request to reduce the parking prohibition on the south west corner of Julian Avenue and Caraway Street.

Staff re-evaluated the parking prohibition on the southwest corner of Julian Avenue and Caraway Street. Staff recommends a reduction in the parking prohibition from 140 feet to 42 feet. The 42 feet of red curb will enhance the line of sight and provide motorists adequate information to determine when they can safely enter Julian Avenue from Caraway Street. Staff will provide an update to the TAC at the June 7, 2013 meeting regarding the modification."

At 10:26 am, Mr. Speake submitted the following appeal:

"This is my official request to appeal this decision on red curb recommendations for Julian Ave and Caraway Street. I have appealed to the board and to your offices on this matter from a common sense standpoint of community, and to a better, safer Julian Ave for all. Common Sense appears to be overlooked, and bureaucracy appears to be overshadowing. The proposed 42 ft of red curb now will only serve to impact My Specific Property and it's on street parking and subsequent property values.

At this point I feel my objections, and those of my neighbors, and the people who live on the street are being ignored. At this point my options for fair resolution become even more limited."

PARKING PROHIBITION ROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DPW-STAFF:

Four proposals would address the significant presence of reported collisions involving parked vehicles along both sides of Julian Avenue in the vicinity of Prospect Avenue and Channel Road.

- 1) north side from Prospect Avenue to Channel Road,
- 2) south side from Prospect Avenue easterly 200 feet,
- 3) south side from Channel Road easterly 70 feet, and
- 4) south side from a point 250 feet east of Channel Road easterly 85 feet.

The remaining four would address the need to maximize visibility for motorists entering Julian Avenue from an apartment's private driveway west of Lemon Crest Drive and in the vicinity of Caraway Street.

- 5) south side, extend an existing 20 foot parking prohibition west of Lemon Crest Drive an additional 40 feet (60 foot total).
- 6) north side from Caraway Street westerly 80 feet,
- 7) south side from Caraway Street westerly 50 feet, and
- 8) south side from Caraway Street easterly 50 feet.

The roadway's high parking demand is recognized and these proposals intend to balance the demand along with the desired goal of reducing potential conflicts and maximizing visibility.

DATA:

Existing Traffic Devices

Julian Avenue is a striped two-lane Through Highway that varies from 32 feet to 64 feet in width. It is posted 35 MPH/Radar Certified between Prospect Avenue and Los Coches Road. The adjacent eastern segment from Los Coches Road to Lake Jennings Park Road is posted 40 MPH/Radar Certified. (NOTE: Julian Avenue east of Channel Road is classified as a Light Collector on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.)

Average Daily Traffic Volumes	3/08	<u>10/01</u>	<u>8/87</u>
Julian Avenue: @ Channel Road E/o Prospect Avenue	7,330*	5,550*	4,190*
Julian Avenue:	<u>2/02</u>		<u>4/95</u>
E/o Petite Lane	6,080* (7 Day Average)		5,550*

^{*} Two-Way Count

Property Owner Survey

1-4. Both sides, in the vicinity of Prospe	ct Avenue and Channel Road.
6 Support 0 Opposed	9 Total Surveyed
	ohibition an additional 40 ft (60 ft total) west of er was surveyed who responded in support of the

6-8. Both sides, in the vicinity of Caraway Street.

_1_Support	_1_Opposed	7 Total Surveyed

Discussion

Staff indicated these matters were previously addressed by the Committee at their December 14, 2012 meeting. Mr. Speake addressed the Board on March 13th to reaffirm his opposition to the proposed parking prohibitions in the vicinity of Caraway Street. The Board tabled all matters and referred them to allow further communication with Mr. Speake and others in the area.

The Committee recalled the results of a recent road review study identified operational measures along Julian Avenue, between Prospect Street and Petite Lane, to maximize visibility and improve the roadway's existing operating conditions due to a high number of collisions involving legally parked vehicles.

The Committee affirmed its previous recommendation to establish four parking prohibitions along both sides of Julian Avenue, in the vicinity of Prospect Avenue and Channel Road, to accommodate the installation of edge-striping as a visual separation between the travel and adjacent parking lanes. Six of the nine affected property owners support the proposed prohibitions and the remaining three did not respond.

Staff stated the proposed 40-foot parking prohibition extension to the existing 20 feet on the south side of Julian Avenue, west of Lemon Crest Drive, was identified as necessary. The extension will maximize visibility for motorists entering Julian Avenue from an apartment private driveway. This matter proceeded through staff's enabling authority. The property manager of the adjacent apartment complex provided written support for its extension. The appropriate sign modification has taken place.

The Committee noted these proposals can be accomplished in a short time frame which will result in long range benefits along with balancing Julian Avenue's high parking demand, reducing potential conflicts and maximizing visibility.

Staff indicated per the Board's direction additional field review took place and the proposed distances where minimized to lessen the impacts along Julian Avenue in the vicinity of Caraway Street. When first reviewed the identified distances were based on operational sight distance requirements. After discussion with concerned residents who

Discussion (continued)

wanted to retain as much parking as possible, the proposed parking prohibitions were shortened based on emergency stopping sight distance requirements.

Mr. Speake reaffirmed continued opposition to the proposed parking prohibitions along both sides of Julian Avenue in the vicinity of Caraway Street. He reiterated belief the

only measures to improve the intersection's operating conditions are to lower the crest at the intersection or establishment of an all-way stop control, which is addressed in Item 2-B. In addition, he expressed the road improvement project along Julian Avenue did nothing to improve the intersection's operation.

The Committee noted the recent road improvement project involved the installation of sidewalk on Julian Avenue between Los Coches Road and Petite Lane. The project's scope of work did not allow any intersectional elevation modifications along this corridor.

After much discussion, the Committee acknowledged staff's desire to be proactive in its pursuit of the proposed parking prohibitions in the vicinity of Caraway Street. However, a review of the intersection's existing operating conditions have changed, the intersection's recent collision pattern has improved since the completion of the sidewalk project. Public street parking is a privilege and very sensitive when homes are involved. The Committee noted when the removal of parking is proposed, substantial evidence of its need is essential and neighborhood support is desired. These conditions do not exist. Therefore, the Committee believes it best not to support the proposed parking prohibitions in this vicinity at this time. It is believed best to allow the intersection to operate in its present state and should past conditions reappear, then would be the appropriate time to address the matter.

The Committee reaffirms its previous support for the installation of advance intersection warning signs for both directions of travel on Julian Avenue as a further reminder to motorists that they are approaching an intersection and to expect cross traffic.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends the following parking prohibitions be established:

- 1) north side from Prospect Avenue to Channel Road,
- 2) south side from Prospect Avenue easterly 200 feet,
- 3) south side from Channel Road easterly 70 feet and
- 4) south side from a point 250 feet east of Channel Road easterly 85 feet.

Maker: Kenney, Second: Bahadori, Vote: 9-0

Necessary Board Action

Add Item Nos. 1415 through 1418 to Traffic Resolution No. 301 relating to No Standing or Parking Zones.

COMMITTEE REPORT OF:

June 7, 2013

Item 2-B

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:

2

SUBJECT:

All-Way Stop Control

LOCATION:

Julian Avenue and Caraway Street, LAKESIDE (Thos.

Bros. 1232-B4) Lakeside Community Planning Group

INITIATED BY:

DPW Traffic Engineering, Mr. Robert Speake

REQUEST:

Review Appropriateness for All-Way Stop Control

PROBLEM AS STATED BY REQUESTER:

On April 26th, 9:42 am, DPW staff sent an email to Mr. Speake, concerned citizen, regarding his request to install an all-way stop at the intersection of Julian Avenue and Caraway Street.

"Regarding all-way stop signs, the County refers to statewide guidelines for installation criteria. All-way stops are recommended at locations with equal traffic volumes entering the intersection or where collisions indicate the need for a higher level of control. Staff determined all-way stop criteria are not met based on traffic volumes and collision history at the intersection. Also, statewide guidelines specifically indicate all-way stops shall not be used for speed control. Although staff is unable to recommend all-way stop control at Julian Avenue and Caraway Street, you can appeal your request to the County Traffic Engineer for consideration through the Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC)."

At 10:26 am, Mr. Speake submitted the following appeal:

"This is my official request to appeal this decision on red curb recommendations for Julian Ave and Caraway Street. I have appealed to the board, and to your offices on this matter from a common sense standpoint of community, and to a better, safer Julian Ave for all. Common Sense appears to be overlooked, and bureaucracy appears to be overshadowing. The proposed 42 ft of red curb now will only serve to impact My Specific Property and it's on street parking and subsequent property values.

At this point I feel my objections, and those of my neighbors, and the people who live on the street are being ignored. At this point my options for fair resolution become even more limited."

Existing Traffic Devices

Julian Avenue is a striped two-lane Through Highway that measures 35 feet wide. There is edge striping along both sides of the road. The road is posted 40 MPH/Radar Certified. This roadway is classified as a Light Collector on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.

Existing Traffic Devices (continued)

Caraway Street measures 26 feet wide. The north leg is a striped two-lane County-maintained roadway. The south leg is an unstriped roadway. Both legs are stop controlled with limit lines and pavement legends in place. This roadway is unclassified on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.

Average Daily Traffic Volumes	04/13	<u>11/11</u>
Caraway Street:		
S/o Julian Avenue	270 NB	
N/o Julian Avenue	430 SB	
Julian Avenue:		
W/o Caraway Street		3,550 EB
E/o Caraway Street		3,370 WB

Collision Data

There have been two reported collisions at this intersection in the last five years, 2 months (01-01-08 to 02-28-13).

Discussion

Mr. Speake, a nearby resident, informed the Committee of excessive speeding taking place along Julian Avenue. He also provided an account of having to clean-up the aftermath of incidents occurring at the intersection. He indicated Julian Avenue is a heavily traversed roadway with much side friction generated by several intersecting streets, multiple driveways, and two nearby schools. He stated the five-year 2-month reported collision history is not a true representation of all the collisions occurring at the intersection, many are unreported. He expressed desire for an all-way stop control to eliminate excessive speeding and improve the intersection's operating conditions.

The Committee acknowledged not all collisions on any location are reported. Usually, unreported collisions tend to involve minor incidents frequently resolved between private parties. Reported collisions are fundamental to the Committee due to their detailed account of an incident's cause and effect.

The Committee explained that an all-way stop control's primary function is to assign right of way at an intersection where a one or two-way stop control has proven to be ineffective. Statewide guidelines assist public agencies in determining when an all-way stop control is needed. These guidelines recognize an all-way stop control is effective in assigning right of way at high-volume intersections with nearly equal volumes of traffic on all legs. An all-way stop control is also warranted at locations with a demonstrated accident problem susceptible to correction by an all-way stop, such as right-angle collisions. None of these guidelines are met at this intersection.

The Committee noted a review of the intersection's existing operating conditions, including an analysis of the most recent five-year 2-month history of reported collisions,

Discussion (continued)

Indicates the majority of motorists traversing the intersection are reasonable and do so in an orderly manner. In addition, there is a significant imbalance of traffic. It would be inappropriate to stop 6,900 vehicles a day on Julian Avenue for 700 vehicles on Caraway Street. The Committee believes an unwarranted all-way stop control would violate driver expectation, create unnecessary delay and backup on Julian Avenue and would be an extreme measure that penalizes the reasonable driver while also depreciating the intersection's operation.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends against the establishment of an all-way stop control at the intersection of Julian Avenue and Caraway Street.

Maker: Kenney, Second: Bahadori, Vote: 9-0

Necessary Board Action

COMMITTEE REPORT OF:

June 7, 2013

Item 2-C

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:

2

SUBJECT:

Radar Recertification

LOCATION:

Sweetwater Road from the Lemon Grove City Limit southerly to the north line of Jamacha Boulevard (2.6 miles) SPRING VALLEY (Thos. Bros. 1270-J7) Spring

Valley Community Planning Group

INITIATED BY:

DPW Traffic Engineering

REQUEST:

Radar Recertification of the Existing 45 MPH Speed

Limit

PROBLEM AS STATED BY REQUESTER:

Sweetwater Road is posted 45 MPH and is radar enforced. Preliminary review of prevailing speeds and roadway conditions support radar recertification for the existing 45 MPH speed limit.

Existing Traffic Devices

Sweetwater Road is a striped four-lane Through Highway that varies from 60 feet to 84 feet wide. There is a two-way left turn lane separating both directions of travel. There are bike lanes along each side of the roadway. The road is posted 45 MPH/Radar Certified. This roadway is classified as a Major Road on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.

Average Daily Traffic Volumes	<u>3/13</u>	<u>6/06</u>
Sweetwater Road:		
S/o Valencia Street	11,510*	
S/o St George Street	14,320*	
N/o Jamacha Road		16,990*

^{*} Two-Way Count

Spot Speed Data	ļ	85th <u>Percentile</u>		% in <u>Pace</u>
Sweetwater Road:	(2013)	48.6 MPH	40-49	76.1%
485' S/o St. George St	(2006)	46.5 MPH	37-46	72.8%
700' S/o Valencia St	(2013)	48.4 MPH	40-49	70.5%
	(2005)	48.6 MPH	38-47	64.3%

Collision Data

There have been 77 reported collisions, one of which involved a fatality, 4 involving pedestrians and 32 involving injury, along this segment of roadway in the last two years, two months (01-1-11 to 02-28-13).

Discussion

The result of the recent speed surveys (48.6 MPH and 48.4 MPH) support radar recertification of the existing 45 MPH speed limit. The posted 45 MPH speed limit was established in 1970 and radar certified in 1983. The Committee noted Sweetwater Road has mixed usage (commercial and single-family homes) along with a significant pedestrian presence associated with nearby Monte Miguel High School and adjacent businesses. Motorists need to have heightened awareness when traversing this busy roadway. The Committee believes the existing 45 MPH speed limit is reasonable and reflective of these conditions.

Representatives from the California Highway Patrol stated the existing 45 MPH speed limit and radar certification is reasonable and appropriate for existing conditions along Sweetwater Road. Radar certification has proven to be an effective tool against excessive speeding and has had a positive effect in reducing the speed of motorists on roadways where radar enforcement takes place. All agreed Sweetwater Road continues to meet their agency's criteria for the use of radar for speed enforcement.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends recertification for continued radar enforcement of the existing 45 MPH speed limit on Sweetwater Road from the Lemon Grove City Limit southerly to Jamacha Boulevard.

Maker: Campbell, Second: Kenney, Vote: 9-0

Necessary Board Action

COMMITTEE REPORT OF:

June 7, 2013

Item 2-D

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:

2

SUBJECT:

Radar Recertification

LOCATION:

Third Street/Old Julian Highway from the south line of State Route 78 southeasterly to a point 2,700 feet east of the east line of Keyes Road (1.3 miles) RAMONA (Thos. Bros. 1152-H5) Ramona Community Planning

Group

INITIATED BY:

DPW Traffic Engineering

REQUEST:

Radar Recertification of the Existing 45 MPH Speed

Limit

PROBLEM AS STATED BY REQUESTER:

Third Street/Old Julian Highway is posted 45 MPH and is radar enforced. Preliminary review of prevailing speeds and roadway conditions support radar recertification for the existing 45 MPH speed limit.

Existing Traffic Devices

Third Street/Old Julian Highway is a striped two-lane Through Highway that varies from 25 feet to 33 feet wide. There is edge-striping along both sides of the road. The road is posted 45 MPH/Radar Certified. This roadway is classified as a Light Collector on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.

Average Daily Traffic Volumes	<u>3/13</u>	<u>5/06</u>	<u>6/93</u>
Third Street: S/o G Street N/o D Street	5,940*	5,350*	6,680*

^{*} Two-Way Count

Spot Speed Data	85th	10 MPH	% in
	<u>Percentile</u>	Pace	<u>Pace</u>
Third Street: @ G Street	(2013) 49.3 MPH	40-49	70.7%
	(2005) 49.0 MPH	39-48	70.5%

Collision Data

There have been 21 reported collisions, 5 of which involved injury, along this segment of roadway in the last five years, two months (01-01-08 to 02-28-13).

Discussion

The result of the recent speed survey (49.3 MPH) supports radar recertification of the existing 45 MPH speed limit. The posted 45 MPH speed limit was established and radar certified in 1989. The Committee believes the existing 45 MPH speed limit continues to be reasonable and reflective of roadway conditions.

When reviewed in 2005, the roadway's 3-year collision history indicated motorists were experiencing difficulty traversing Third Street/Old Julian Highway. A review of the most recent 5-year collision history indicates reasonable motorists are making the necessary adjustments while traversing this rural, curvilinear roadway. Although this segment of Third Street/Old Julian Highway is not collision-free and speed-related collisions still occur, it confirms the existing 45 MPH speed limit and radar certification is reasonable and appropriate for existing conditions.

Representatives from the California Highway Patrol stated radar certification has proven to be an effective tool against excessive speeding and has had a positive effect in reducing the speed of motorists on roadways where radar enforcement takes place. All agreed this segment of roadway continues to meet their agency's criteria for the use of radar for speed enforcement.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends recertification for continued radar enforcement of the existing 45 MPH speed limit on Third Street/Old Julian Highway from State Route 78 southeasterly to a point 2,700 feet east of Keyes Road.

Maker: Campbell, Second: Kenney, Vote: 9-0

Necessary Board Action

COMMITTEE REPORT OF:

June 7, 2013

Item 2-E

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:

2

SUBJECT:

Radar Recertification

LOCATION:

Woodside Avenue from the west line of Maine Avenue westerly to the east line of Riverview Avenue (0.93 miles) LAKESIDE (Thos. Bros. 1232-B3) Lakeside

Community Planning Group

INITIATED BY:

DPW Traffic Engineering

REQUEST:

Radar Recertification of the Existing 35 MPH Speed

Limit

PROBLEM AS STATED BY REQUESTER:

Woodside Avenue is posted 35 MPH and is radar enforced. Preliminary review of prevailing speeds and roadway conditions support radar recertification for the existing 35 MPH speed limit.

Existing Traffic Devices

Woodside Avenue, east of Winter Gardens Boulevard, is a striped four-lane Through Highway that varies from 32 feet to 92 feet wide. There is a two-way left-turn lane separating both directions of travel. There are bike lanes along both sides of the road. The road is posted 35 MPH/Radar Certified. This roadway is classified as a Boulevard on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.

Woodside Avenue, west of Winter Gardens Boulevard, is a striped Through Highway that varies from 38 feet to 82 feet wide. There are two eastbound lanes and one westbound lane. There is a short segment with one lane for each direction of travel. There are bike lanes along both sides of the road. A portion of the roadway also has a parking lane along the south side. The road is posted 35 MPH/Radar Certified. This roadway is classified as a Boulevard on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.

Average Daily Traffic Volumes	<u>4/09</u>	4/02	<u>5/98</u>	<u>7/97</u>
Woodside Avenue:				
E/o Winter Gardens Blvd	22,020*		25,350*	
W/o Winter Gardens Blvd		10,900*		
W/o Channel Rd		21,830*		
E/o Riverview Avenue				10,520*

^{*} Two-Way Count

Spot Speed Data	85 th		10 MPH	% in
	<u>Percentile</u>		<u>Pace</u>	<u>Pace</u>
Woodside Avenue:	(2013)	39.2 MPH	30-39	72.6%
400' W/o Prospect Ave.	(2005)	39.8 MPH	32- 4 1	83.9%

Collision Data

There have been 38 reported collisions, 2 of which involved pedestrians and 13 involving injury) along this segment of roadway in the last five years, two months (01-1-08 to 02-28-13).

Discussion

The result of the recent speed survey (39.2 MPH) supports radar recertification of the existing 35 MPH speed limit. The posted 35 MPH speed limit was established in 1974 and radar certified in 1996. The Committee believes the existing 35 MPH speed limit continues to be reasonable and reflective of roadway conditions.

When reviewed in 2005, the roadway's 3-year collision history indicated motorists were experiencing difficulty navigating through the higher than usual side friction association with numerous adjacent commercial driveways. A review of the most recent 5-year collision history indicates motorists are making the necessary adjustments while traversing this busy, high-volume roadway. Woodside Avenue is operating well in its present state.

Woodside Avenue continues to serve as a major commuter route and connecting link for the Lakeside community between the City of Santee, State Route 67 and Interstate 8. The existing 35 MPH speed limit and radar certification is reasonable and appropriate for existing conditions. The adjacent western 40 MPH segment is also radar certified. Recertification along this portion ensures uniformity and consistency with radar speed enforcement along Woodside Avenue from Maine Avenue westerly to the Santee City Limit.

Representatives from the California Highway Patrol stated radar certification has proven to be an effective tool against excessive speeding and has had a positive effect in reducing the speed of motorists on roadways where radar enforcement takes place. All agreed Woodside Avenue continues to meet their agency's criteria for the use of radar for speed enforcement.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends recertification for continued radar enforcement of the existing 35 MPH speed limit on Woodside Avenue from Maine Avenue westerly to Riverview Avenue.

Maker: Campbell, Second: Kenney, Vote: 9-0

Necessary Board Action

COMMITTEE REPORT OF:

June 7, 2013

Item 5-A

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:

5

SUBJECT:

Two-Hour Time Limit Parking

LOCATION:

De La Valle Plaza, both sides, from Via de la Valle northerly to End of County-maintenance (250 feet) DEL MAR (Thos.Bros.1188-A1) San Dieguito

Community Planning Group

INITIATED BY:

RB General LLC, 3702 Via De La Valle, Suite 102, Del

Mar, CA 92014

REQUEST:

Establish Two-Hour Time Limit Parking

PROBLEM AS STATED BY REQUESTER:

Polo Plaza, LLC, is requesting two-hour timed parking at 14800 De La Valle Place, the street separating our two commercial buildings located on the east and west sides of 14800 De La Valle Place. We are making this request on behalf of our building's businesses that could use the parking throughout the day but because cars park there all day and sometime longer term they reduce the ability of visitors to our building who are dropping off or having short meetings from availing themselves of parking. We also have people parking during the County Fair and racing season who have nothing to do with the businesses in our building but leave cars there depriving our clients and tenants and visitors of short-term parking.

DPW-Traffic Engineering reviewed this request and has no opposition to the request as a traffic safety issue. This matter was deemed as "Quality of Life". The process for these type of matters requires the requester submit the proposal to the affected community planning or sponsor group for review and comment.

The San Dieguito Community Planning Group has submitted formal support for the proposed two-hour time limit parking along the both sides of the County-maintained portion along De La Valle Place.

DATA:

Existing Traffic Devices

De La Valle Place is an unstriped 53-foot wide roadway that continues into a private gated community beyond County-maintenance.

Collision Data

There have been no reported collisions in the vicinity of the proposed time limit parking segment in the last five years (02-28-08 to 02-28-13).

Discussion

The Committee was informed by staff that this request has been determined to be a "Quality of Life" matter and staff is not opposed to the request as a traffic safety issue. The process for these type of matters requires the requester to submit the proposal to the affected community planning or sponsor group for review and comment.

The San Dieguito Community Planning Group has submitted formal support for the proposed two-hour time limit parking along both sides of the County-maintained portion of De La Valle Place.

The Committee noted this area has a high parking demand; the proposed two-hour time limit will facilitate short-term parking for the adjacent commercial complexes and will eliminate unassociated long-term parking.

The representatives from the California Highway Patrol-Oceanside Office indicated his office's support for the proposed two-hour time-limit parking. He also indicated enforcement will take place on an as-needed basis when work scheduling and priorities allow.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends the establishment of two-hour time limit parking along both sides of De La Valle Plaza from Via de la Valle northerly to End of Countymaintenance (250 feet).

Maker: Kenney, Second: Campbell, Vote: 8-0 (1 abstention)

Necessary Board Action

Add Section 72.143.13.4. to Division 2 of Title 7 of Article 9 of the San Diego County Code.

COMMITTEE REPORT OF:

June 7, 2013

Item 5-B

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:

5

SUBJECT:

All-Way Stop Control

LOCATION:

Alturas Road and Fallbrook Street, FALLBROOK

(Thos. Bros. 1027-E3) Fallbrook Community Planning

Group

INITIATED BY:

Fallbrook Union Elementary School District

REQUEST:

Review Appropriateness for All-Way Stop Control

PROBLEM AS STATED BY REQUESTER:

We would like to have Fallbrook Street & Alturas Road surveyed for possible stop signs on Alturas Road for the safety of our students. Any help from the County is very much appreciated by the School District.

Existing Traffic Devices

Alturas Road is a striped two-lane Through Highway. The north leg measures 34 feet wide and is posted 25 MPH. The south leg measures 38 feet wide and is posted 35 MPH/Radar Certified. This roadway is unclassified on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.

Fallbrook Street, the east leg, is a striped two-lane County-maintained roadway that measures 38 feet wide and is posted 25 MPH. The west leg is an unstriped private culde-sac that measures 30 feet wide. Both legs are stop controlled with limit lines and pavement legends in place. This roadway is unclassified on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.

Average Daily Traffic Volumes	04/13	<u>05/98</u>	<u>09/79</u>
Alturas Road: S/o Fallbrook Street N/o Fallbrook Street	1,770 NB 920 SB	1,840 NB 790 SB	280 NB 240 SB
Fallbrook Street: W/o Alturas Road E/o Alturas Road	400 EB 2,580 WB	1,310 WB	260 WB

Collision Data

There has been no reported collisions at this intersection in the last five years (02-28-08 to 02-28-13).

Discussion

An all-way stop control's primary function is to assign more positive right-of-way at an intersection where a one or two-way stop control has proven to be ineffective. State guidelines have been developed to assist public agencies in determining when an all-way stop control is needed. These guidelines recognize an all-way stop control is effective in assigning right-of-way at high volume intersections with nearly equal volumes of traffic on all legs.

The Committee noted the intersection of Alturas Road and Fallbrook Street effectively meets the volume warrant used to justify an all-way stop control installation. The Committee noted entering volumes are equally balanced on all approaches. A review of the intersection's existing operating conditions indicates its' traffic patterns were significantly altered when the west leg of Fallbrook Street was constructed approximately fifteen years ago. Prior to that, the intersection operated as a Standard "Tee" intersection. Alturas Road, as the thoroughfare, had the highest traffic volumes. Presently, westbound traffic on Fallbrook Street is almost equal to the combined northbound and southbound approaching volumes on Alturas Street.

In addition, the intersection has a significant adult and child pedestrian presence due to its close proximity to an adjacent park, Fallbrook Post office and Fallbrook Street School. Sight visibility is more than adequate for eastbound motorists on Fallbrook Street approaching Alturas Road. However to maximize visibility for the westbound approach, the STOP limit line is closer to the intersection than usual. Sight visibility would be negatively impacted if the limit line were to be pushed back. Although this is the desired crossing location for those residing to the south, the proximity of vehicles does not generate the desired comfort level.

The Committee noted this intersection is located just to the west of Mission Road. Historically, Alturas Road and Fallbrook Street have been used as short-cut routes to and from the Fallbrook Naval Weapons Station. Recent modifications (striping and traffic signal timing modifications) along Mission Road and Ammunition Road have been successful in discouraging commuters from utilizing residential roadways as commuter routes.

The Committee believes these unique circumstances effectively justify the installation of an all-way stop control. The intersection's balanced distribution of traffic indicates motorists will adhere to the all-way stop control since they will observe cross traffic also stopping at the intersection. The proposed all-way stop control is the most appropriate measure to clearly define assignment of right-of-way. Also, in conjunction to further increase the comfort level for school-associated pedestrians, yellow crosswalks will be installed at the four intersecting corners. The proposed all-way stop control will reinforce driver's expectation and further encourage commuters to continue on the major routes and not impact these high-density residential roadways.

A concerned citizen indicated these measures will benefit existing conditions and will increase the level of comfort for all traversing the intersection.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends the establishment of an all-way stop control at the intersection of Alturas Road and Fallbrook Street.

Maker: Kenney, Second: Campbell, Vote: 7-2

Necessary Board Action

Add Item No. 231 to Traffic Resolution No. 299 relating to All-Way Stop Intersections.

Amend Item No. 918 of Traffic Resolution No. 305 under the heading, FALLBROOK-BONSALL-PALA, relating to Through Highways.

COMMITTEE REPORT OF:

June 7, 2013

Item 5-C

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:

5

SUBJECT:

Radar Recertification

LOCATION:

El Camino Real from the San Diego City Limit northerly to the south line of Linea del Cielo (1.2 miles) RANCHO SANTA FE (Thos. Bros. 1188-B1) San

Dieguito Community Planning Group

INITIATED BY:

DPW Traffic Engineering

REQUEST:

Radar Recertification of the Existing 45 MPH Speed

Limit

PROBLEM AS STATED BY REQUESTER:

El Camino Real is posted 45 MPH and is radar enforced. Preliminary review of prevailing speeds and roadway conditions support radar recertification for the existing 45 MPH speed limit.

Existing Traffic Devices

El Camino Real is a striped two-lane Through Highway that varies from 24 feet to 35 feet wide. There is edge-striping along both sides of the roadway. The road is posted 45 MPH/Radar Certified. This roadway is classified as a Light Collector on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.

Average Daily Traffic Volumes	<u>3/13</u>	<u>4/02</u>	<u>2/90</u>
El Camino Real: N/o Sun Valley Road N/o San Diego City Limit S/o Sun Valley Road	2,900*	3,990*	2,860*

^{*}Two-Way Count

Spot Speed Data	85th	10 MPH	% in
	<u>Percentile</u>	Pace	<u>Pace</u>
El Camino Real:	(2013) 48.1 MPH	38-47	61.0%
@ 2,000 N/o Sun Valley Rd	(2005) 47.7 MPH	37-46	66.6%

Collision Data

There have been five reported collisions, one of which involved injury, along this segment of roadway in the last five years, two months (01-01-08 to 02-28-13).

Discussion

The result of the recent speed survey (48.1 MPH) supports radar recertification of the existing 45 MPH speed limit. The posted 45 MPH speed limit and radar certification was established in 1999. El Camino Real is a residential curvilinear roadway with many adjacent driveways, several of which are hidden with mature vegetation, along with a significant pedestrian and equestrian presence. The Committee believes the existing 45 MPH speed limit continues to be reasonable and reflective of roadway conditions.

El Camino Real continues to serve as a commuter route and connecting link for the Rancho Santa Fe community between the City of San Diego, nearby beach cities and Interstate 5. The existing 45 MPH speed limit and radar certification is reasonable and appropriate for existing conditions. The adjacent northern segments are also radar certified. Recertification along this portion ensures uniformity and consistency with radar speed enforcement along the entirety of El Camino Real from the San Diego City Limit northerly to La Bajada.

Representatives from the California Highway Patrol stated radar certification has proven to be an effective tool against excessive speeding and has had a positive effect in reducing the speed of motorists on roadways where radar enforcement takes place. All agreed El Camino Real continues to meet their agency's criteria for the use of radar for speed enforcement.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends recertification for continued radar enforcement of the existing 45 MPH speed limit on El Camino Real from the San Diego City Limit northerly to Linea del Cielo.

Maker: Campbell, Second: Kenney, Vote: 9-0

Necessary Board Action

COMMITTEE REPORT OF:

June 7, 2013

Item 5-D

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:

5

SUBJECT:

Radar Recertification

LOCATION:

El Camino Real from the north line of Linea del Cielo northerly to the south line of La Orilla (1.2 miles) RANCHO SANTA FE (Thos. Bros. 1168-B6) San

Dieguito Community Planning Group

INITIATED BY:

DPW Traffic Engineering

REQUEST:

Radar Recertification of the Existing 45 MPH Speed

Limit

PROBLEM AS STATED BY REQUESTER:

El Camino Real is posted 45 MPH and is radar enforced. Preliminary review of prevailing speeds and roadway conditions support radar recertification for the existing 45 MPH speed limit.

Existing Traffic Devices

El Camino Real is a striped two-lane Through Highway that measures approximately 32 feet wide. There is edge-striping along both sides of the roadway. The road is posted 45 MPH/Radar Certified. This roadway is classified as a Light Collector on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.

Average Daily Traffic Volumes	<u>4/13</u>	<u>2/05</u>	<u>9/98</u>
El Camino Real: S/o Via Gaviota @ Highland Drive	6,140*	5,440*	6,010*

^{*} Two-Way Count

Spot Speed Data	85th	10 MPH	% in
	<u>Percentile</u>	Pace	<u>Pace</u>
El Camino Real:	(2013) 47.0 MPH	38-47	73.0%
100' s/o Via Gaviota	(2005) 48.4 MPH	40-49	67.6%

Collision Data

There have been six reported collisions, three of which involved injury, along this segment of roadway in the last five years, two months (01-01-08 to 02-28-13).

Discussion

The result of the recent speed survey (47.0 MPH) supports radar recertification of the existing 45 MPH speed limit. The posted 45 MPH speed limit was established in 1989 and radar certified in 1999. El Camino Real is a residential curvilinear roadway with many adjacent driveways, several of which are hidden with mature vegetation, along with a significant pedestrian and equestrian presence. The Committee believes the existing 45 MPH speed limit continues to be reasonable and reflective of roadway conditions.

El Camino Real continues to serve as a commuter route and connecting link for the Rancho Santa Fe community between San Dieguito County Park, the City of San Diego, nearby beach cities and Interstate 5. The existing 45 MPH speed limit and radar certification is reasonable and appropriate for existing conditions. The adjacent northern and southern segments are also radar certified. Recertification along this portion ensures uniformity and consistency with radar speed enforcement along the entirety of El Camino Real from the San Diego City Limit northerly to La Bajada.

Representatives from the California Highway Patrol stated radar certification has proven to be an effective tool against excessive speeding and has had a positive effect in reducing the speed of motorists on roadways where radar enforcement takes place. All agreed El Camino Real continues to meet their agency's criteria for the use of radar for speed enforcement.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends recertification for continued radar enforcement of the existing 45 MPH speed limit on El Camino Real from Linea del Cielo northerly to La Orilla.

Maker: Campbell, Second: Kenney, Vote: 9-0

Necessary Board Action

COMMITTEE REPORT OF:

June 7, 2013

Item 5-E

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:

5

SUBJECT:

Radar Recertification

LOCATION:

Gopher Canyon Road from the west line of Spa Havens Way westerly to the east line of East Vista Way (1.8 miles) BONSALL (Thos. Bros. 1068-C6) Bonsall

Community Sponsor Group

INITIATED BY:

DPW Traffic Engineering

REQUEST:

Radar Recertification of the Existing 45 MPH Speed

Limit

PROBLEM AS STATED BY REQUESTER:

Gopher Canyon Road is posted 45 MPH and is radar enforced. Preliminary review of prevailing speeds and roadway conditions support radar recertification for the existing 45 MPH speed limit.

Existing Traffic Devices

Gopher Canyon Road is a striped two-lane Through Highway that varies from 27 feet to 42 feet wide. It has a 7-ton weight limitation. There is edge-striping along both sides of the roadway. The road is posted 45 MPH/Radar Certified. This roadway is classified as a Major Road on the County General Plan Mobility Element Network.

Average Daily Traffic Volumes	<u>5/13</u>	9/04	<u>7/95</u>
Gopher Canyon Road: W/o Little Gopher Cyn Rd W/o Valley Vista Drive	14,990* 14.980*	16,480*	8,270*
W/o I-15	14,000	7,870*	

^{*} Two-Way Count

Spot Speed Data	85th	10 MPH	% in
	<u>Percentile</u>	Pace	<u>Pace</u>
Gopher Canyon Road:	(2013) 48.3 MPH	40-49	79.9%
1540' E/o Fairview Dr	(2006) 52.0 MPH	44-53	78.1%

Collision Data

There have been 41 reported collisions, 2 of which involved fatalities and 23 involving injury) along this segment of roadway in the last five years, two months (01-01-08 to 02-28-13).

Discussion

The result of the recent speed survey (48.3 MPH) supports radar recertification of the existing 45 MPH speed limit. The posted 45 MPH speed limit was established in 1988 and radar certified in 1995. Gopher Canyon Road is a rural curvilinear roadway with many adjacent public and private intersections as well as several residential driveways. It serves as a commuter route and connecting link for the Vista/Bonsall communities between State Route 76 and Interstate 15. A review of the most recent 5-year collision history indicates reasonable motorists are making the necessary adjustments while traversing this busy, high volume roadway.

Representatives from the California Highway Patrol stated radar certification has proven to be an effective tool against excessive speeding and has had a positive effect in reducing the speed of motorists on roadways where radar enforcement takes place. All agreed El Camino Real continues to meet their agency's criteria for the use of radar for speed enforcement.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends recertification for continued radar enforcement of the existing 45 MPH speed limit on Gopher Canyon Road from Spa Havens Way westerly to East Vista Way

Maker: Campbell, Second: Kenney, Vote: 9-0

Necessary Board Action

TRAFFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING OF: June 7, 2013

KENTON R. JONES

Secretary

DISTRIBUTION:

Board of Supervisors, Clerk Director, Department of Public Works DCAO